

Greater Rochester International Airport (ROC)

Monroe County, New York

Airport Screener Privatization Pilot Program (PP5)

April 22, 2004

Mr. Chairman:

I am Terry Slaybaugh, Director of Aviation for the Greater Rochester International Airport in Monroe County, New York and have been for the past 8 years. I am on the Board and am past President from 2000 until 2003 of the New York State Aviation Management Association, representing the interest of aviation in the state, including the interest of the nineteen Part 139 Commercial Airports. Prior to the Airport I served as Director of Economic Development for Monroe County.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our experience during the past two years with the PP5 program and TSA at the Greater Rochester International Airport (ROC). Based upon our experience, we (ROC) have been and continue to be convinced that private screening is a more efficient and effective way to protect the air traveling public and do so at a cost that is affordable for our industry.

While we are convinced that private screening is more effective and efficient, the Pilot Program has not been implemented in a way to make an effective comparison because both federal and private workforces have been “managed and staffed in the same way”.

At a March 22, 2003 Hearing, Rochester presented a March 2003 Report providing a thorough analysis of the direct Cost of Screening at ROC and showed that it Totaled at that time \$17.6 Million, exceeding the \$13.4 Million Airport operating Budget by over \$4.0 Million. We also provided a detailed plan showing how that \$15 cost per enplaned passenger could be reduced to \$7.00 per passenger by implementing the \$9.5 Million or 54% reductions recommended in our Analysis. This report has been updated several times and presented to the TSA.

We have had no fewer than a half dozen meetings and correspondence to the TSA regarding this and other savings recommendations and have not seen any of those recommendations accepted or implemented.

While I have a number of observations of the TSA in general, I will focus this testimony on the PP5 Program.

PP5 Implementation as experienced in Rochester:

Current Airport Screener Privatization Pilot Program (PP5):

The current Pilot Screening program is a pilot in name only. TSA makes all the decisions and the private screening company implements them. The airport Director and staff , as well as the airlines, have been effectively excluded from the process. The TSA often implements changes to the PP5 workforce at ROC without informing either the Airport Administration or carriers.

Thus, the most inclusive and competent body of Airport experience has not been adequately included in TSA decisions resulting in less than optimal effectiveness on the part of TSA and a waste of significant federal taxpayer dollars and; in some instances, Airport dollars and resources. This seems to be a common problem throughout the TSA implementation model.

At ROC, the TSA has not embraced the Airport Director and staff in a meaningful role in the Pilot or test. A reading of what appears to be the TSA "Operating Philosophy Process" described in GAO-03-190; there is no mention of a role for airport directors and staff in the operations of TSA. This raises the question of whether or not TSA feels it can operate totally independently of the knowledge and experience of the Airport Director, Air Carriers and our respective staff. As an example the TSA PP5 Program Coordinator visited Rochester to hold a meeting of the PP5 FSD's. While I asked several times to meet with the Coordinator while he was in Rochester I only met with him for a few minutes by accident. In that few minutes I suggested that a similar meeting be held of the PP5 Airport Directors. I never heard from him again even though I had volunteered to coordinate such a meeting.

The management infrastructure for the TSA in Rochester and other PP5 Airports is the same as non-PP5 Airports. This "One size fits all implementation" results in an over staffing of TSA Managers with no one to supervise, creating a wasteful and non valued-added expense. While this was pointed out to the TSA, nothing has changed. We have recommended that the number of TSA direct people could easily be reduced from the 20 authorized positions to 5 at ROC saving at least \$1.5 million per year in Direct TSA personnel cost.

The federal law creating PP5 requires TSA supervision of private screening activities. Supervisory responsibility is duplicated with the private screening company by contract. The company is required to provide supervision and management of screeners, leaving TSA supervisory staff with little or nothing to do. This implementation duplicates supervisory responsibilities of the private company creating redundancy and waste.

Innovations in process and technology have come from the Private sector in this country, not from Government.

Effective Pilot/ Private Program:

A True Pilot Program should foster innovation, reduce cost and optimize effectiveness. Rochester strongly recommends that a plan be formulated and defined in an MOU or some other agreement with the sponsoring Airport that identifies the roles of the TSA, screening company, airport staff and air carriers.

The following requirements would insure an effective and optimal Pilot / Private Program:

1. An MOU, or some other document between TSA the private screening company, Airport and air carriers setting forth the goals and objectives of a "Pilot / Private" Program. The goals and objectives should identify areas where the TSA, private companies, Airports and our airline partners can improve security screening, create efficiencies, identify cost savings, test new

products, technologies and applications and thereby institutionalize innovations in the screening process.

2. The Airport, TSA, private screening companies and Airlines form a Management Team to measure Goals and Objectives to:
 - Identify planned savings.
 - Organize and staff the implementation.
 - Define Responsibilities and authority of TSA, Airport, the contractor and airlines.
 - Establish monitoring Controls, Reporting and Evaluation criteria for the implementation.
 - Formally evaluate each other's performance
3. The scope should include all participants "Recommendations" whether the applications for utilization is on the TSA approved list or not. This will encourage testing of alternative applications, products and systems thereby facilitating the implementation of innovations to improve security.
4. TSA should be responsible for Standards, Regulations, Oversight and Compliance.
5. The Airport should lead from a program management point of view in order to insure the optimal innovation resulting in it being a true Pilot or Private Program.

6. Airport to issue quarterly reports covering;
 - Progress, Problems, Issues and Opportunities,
 - Measurement against agreed upon metrics.
7. Airport and TSA to formally meet bi-monthly to plan and review implementation progress and evaluate results.
8. The TSA should be required to formally respond to Airport Recommendations with in 7 business days or a longer time if mutually agreed to. We have experienced a frequent lack of response and that is not acceptable.
9. A true team based approach (which has not existed for the past two years) leveraging the knowledge and experience of both the airport as well as the airlines would reduce the need for unnecessary TSA administration people and not only reduce cost but more importantly improve efficiency and effectiveness of security.

This concludes my comments and recommendations pertaining to the PP5 Program.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate and are there any questions?